IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 6751 of 2001

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

PRANAV A RAVAL

Versus

STATE OF GUJARAT

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 6751 of 2001

MR UI VYAS for Petitioner No. 1

MR AY KOGJE, AGP, for Respondent No. 1

CORAM : MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH

Date of decision: 29/10/2002

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Rule. Mr Kogje, learned AGP, waives service of rule on behalf of the respondent.

2. The petitioner's father expired on 5-4-1998 while in service as a Clerk in the Education Department of the State Government. The petitioner's mother also expired on 19-9-1998. The petitioner's application for compassionate appointment has been rejected by communication dated 28-8-2000 (Annexure B) from the Section Officer to the State Government in the General Administration Department on the ground that the income of the family of the deceased exceeded the stipulated income of Rs.2500/- per month.

At this stage, it may be pointed out that according to the petitioner, the petitioner is not even being paid the family pension on account of the fact that the petitioner's mother has also expired and, therefore, in any view of the matter, the income is less than Rs.2500/- per month.

3. The contention raised by the petitioner is that as per the Government Resolution dated 10-3-2000 the income limit has been done away with. Reliance is also placed on the decision dated 15-6-2001 of this Court in Special Civil Application No.799 of 2001 and other decisions.

4. At the hearing of the petition today, the learned counsel for the petitioner relies on the Government Resolution dated 7-9-2002 laying down that the Government Resolution dated 10-3-2000 doing away with the income limit in matters of compassionate appointment shall be given effect from 1-1-1996.

5. In view of the aforesaid resolution, it is clear that in cases where deceased expired on or after 1-1-1996, the compassionate appointment cannot be refused on the ground of the income of the families exceeding the prescribed limit as no limit would now be applicable.

6. In view of the statement being made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the death of the father of the petitioner took place while holding office and on or after 1-1-1996 i.e. on 5-4-1998, it is obvious that the present case will be governed by the Government Resolution dated 10-3-2000 read with the Government Resolution dated 7-9-2002.

7. In view of the above discussion, this petition is allowed. The impugned decision rejecting the application of the petitioner for compassionate appointment on the ground that the income of the family exceeds the prescribed limit is quashed and set aside, and the

respondent is directed to re-consider the case of the petitioner on the basis of the aforesaid Government Resolution dated 10-3-2000 read with the Government Resolution dated 7-9-2002. This direction shall be complied with within two months from the date of receipt of the writ of this Court or a certified copy of this judgment, whichever is earlier.

Rule is made absolute with no order as to costs.

Direct service is permitted.

(M.S. Shah,J)

zgs/-